DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 961 JC 750 512

AUTHOR Menard, Joseph W.
TITLE Developing an Instrument for Evaluating Faculty by Students, Colleagues, and Administrators at Rhode Island Junior College.
PUB DATE 5 May 75
NOTE 55p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; Questionnaires; *Rating Scales; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Rhode Island Junior College

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to devise a standardized faculty evaluation instrument which could be used by all departments at Rhode Island Junior College and which could be easily filled out by students, colleagues, and the department chairpersons of the instructor being evaluated. In order to ascertain the preferences of the college community regarding items which should be incorporated into such an instrument, two attitudinal questionnaires were designed and administered to 70 faculty members and a random sample of 200 students. One of the questionnaires related to preferred instrument format; the other to the characteristics essential to effective faculty performance. Among five alternative formats for the evaluation instrument, those polled preferred a multiple choice format. The selected characteristics of effective instructors closely paralleled the characteristics cited in the literature of the field. The developed instrument (which contains 50 items, with separate sections for students, advisees, faculty, and division chairpersons) is presented, as are both preliminary questionnaires and tables displaying questionnaire results. Pilot testing, revision, and college-wide implementation of the instrument are recommended. (RL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED112961

DEVELOPING AN INSTRUMENT FOR EVALUATING FACULTY BY STUDENTS, COLLEAGUES, AND ADMINISTRATORS AT RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE

BY

JOSEPH W. MENARD, ED. M.
FALL RIVER CLUSTER

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

MAY 5, 1975

JC 750 512

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	2
PROCEDURES	5
RESULTS	7
RECOMMENDATIONS	14
NOTES AND REFERENCES	17
BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
APPENDICES	23
APPENDIX A — A questionnaire designed to determine the type of faculty evaluation form which would be preferred at Rhode Island Junior College	23
APPENDIX B — A questionnaire designed to determine factors and attributes necessary for evaluating faculty at Rhode Island Junior College	31
APPENDIX C — Rhode Island Junior College Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire	37

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Numerical data for Appendix A, questionnaire and form preference.	50
II.	Numerical data for Appendix B, questionnaire on factors and attributes (Section I)	51

INTRODUCTION

Rhode Island Junior College has no formal policy for evaluation of instruction beyond the statement that, "all full-time faculty shall be evaluated yearly."[1] How it is done, when it is done, and by whom, is left to the whims of each department and, in many cases, to each instructor within a department. The use and distribution of any results is also questionable.

This writer agrees with Kinnibrew,[2] Vandervert,[3] and others, that evaluation should be directed towards the betterment of educational programs of an institution and to meet the goals and objectives of that institution. Further, says Richardson,[4] it shouldn't be used to threaten faculty members' security and financial status.

Because of the divergent methods taken by, and within, departments at Rhode Island Junior College, results will be nebulous. Neither faculty nor administration can use them for any rational purpose with any degree of reliability.

For these reasons, this writer undertook to devise an evaluation instrument which could be used by all departments and which could be easily filled out by students, colleagues, and department chairmen of the person being evaluated. By involving those who are being evaluated, as well as those who are doing the evaluating, in the designing of a questionnaire it is expected a more acceptable and reliable instrument will emerge.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Educational institutions throughout the United States are increasingly being asked to become 'accountable' for their performance. Administrators are demanding faculty evaluations, for various reasons, and in many instances faculty are requesting evaluation to measure their teaching effectiveness. Students, more independent and self-disciplined than ever, recognize that learning is more and more their responsibility. This insight is aided by such experiental factors as exposure to self-paced instructional courses and Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) programs. Administrators are beginning to feel the backlash from the arrogant and despotic decision-making methods used in the past and, to effectively run a college, are relying increasingly upon shared authority. Very infrequently will people "accept policy decisions that were generated without participation."[5]

There are no policy guidelines to be followed for evaluation of instructors at Rhode Island Junior College. There is still disagreement about who is to do the evaluating; should students be involved? Colleagues? Department Chairmen? Also, there are no means of distributing any results, nor is there any way to tell what these results will be used for.

Student evaluation of faculty at Rhode Island Junior College is a hit-or-miss affair. Some departments use questionnaires which they have designed themselves. In

other departments, individual faculty members hand out sheets of paper to their classes and ask students to write out an evaluation. Even after this is done there is little, if any, method for compiling conclusions. Sometimes results are never used. Sometimes returned questionnaires are screened by the instructor to eliminate the noxious ones. It is also sad, as Miller reports, that most students "believe that the professor can recognize their handwriting."[6] To compound this problem, it is a direct threat to students when they are required to sign their names to a written evaluation they do in class, which some instructors demand. "Evidence clearly indicates that students can evaluate teaching fairly and perceptively."[7] This reinforces the statement by Bornheimer, that, "evaluations should be made by the group that is exposed directly and continously to the process--the students."[8]

Cohen[9] comments that students recognize the fact that a teacher has taught them well, while faculty resent being rated by inexperienced and immature students, says Monro,[10] even though that appears to be the best method of faculty evaluation. Miller[11] denies the immaturity of students, however, where evaluating teaching is concerned.

Presently there is no evaluation of an instructor at Rhode Island Junior College by his colleagues. "Even when peer evaluation procedures are highly systematized, as detailed in faculty association recommendations," claims Cohen, "their value is open to question."[12] If, however, the faculty is involved in preparing a carefully designed questionnaire for colleague evaluation, as recommended by Trent,[13] maybe such trouble caused by this type of evaluation can be avoided, as indicated by Miller.[14]

Administrative evaluation of faculty is done mainly by the chairmen of the departments at Rhode Island Junior College. Once each year, each chairman is required to write an anecdotal report to the dean regarding his faculty.

Various methods are used -- and misused! Some chairmen call in their faculty, inform them of their observations, show them the report, and have it signed. The possibility that there has been a visit to the classroom for observation is minimal, despite Deegan's[15] claim that this is the most widely used form of chairman evaluation. Another method of evaluation is for the chairman to request the faculty member to write up his own report and the chairman then turns that in as his evaluation of the instructor. The objectivity of these evaluations is certainly questionable! If there was a standard form, with clear guidelines for use, some of these inequities may be avoided.

Richardson,[16] warns us against being punitive with the results of faculty evaluation. It's overriding purpose "must be to improve the instructional program,"[17] and to, "make informed judgements and decisions about the development, implementation, and effectiveness of instruction."[18] This implies that feedback is important and necessary to faculty to help them develop effective teaching skills and strategies.

Evaluation is a "threatening procedure regardless of how it is approached,"[19] warns Miller, and, "the potential threat to his own self-esteem is probably as great as to his position on the faculty."[20]

Rhode Island Junior College should foster an atmosphere whereby all constituents; faculty, students, and administrators, would become willingly involved to design and administer a standardized evaluation form. At present, there are no ways to indicate which faculty members could benefit from a revitalization of professional and personal goals. A standardized, fair, evaluation instrument, specifically designed for Rhode Island Junior College personnel can aid in locating those who could benefit most from such improvement.

PROCEDURES

In order to design an instrument which would meet the needs and desires at Rhode Island Junior College, this writer designed two attitudinal questionnaires to ascertain the preferences of the college community regarding items which should be incorporated into such an instrument.

These questionnaires were distributed at the Providence Campus of Rhode Island Junior College which accomodates approximately 850 students and 70 faculty. Each faculty member received a questionnaire in his mailbox. A random sample of 200 students were given surveys in various locations about the campus, such as the cafeteria, lounge, and some classrooms.

The first questionnaire (Appendix A) was intended to determine what type of format the college community preferred. There were eight types of forms illustrated. The author borrowed from diverse sources such as the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire suggested by Aleamoni[21] and an eclectic form such as that mentioned by Kelley.[22] Numerous other types, which are commonly used, were also illustrated. Respondents were requested to read over the eight types offered and to check off the two they most preferred, with a first and second place designation. There was space provided at the conclusion of each type shown for any comments regarding that particular one. Further, there was room left for comments after their preferences were listed.

The second questionnaire (Appendix B) was an attempt

to discover the preferences of the characteristics that should be evaluated in a Rhode Island Junior College instructor. Section I consisted of nine categories, adapted from Miller,[23] from which respondents were requested to check off those three they thought were most important for assessing faculty performance at Rhode Island Junior College. Section II subdivides each of these nine categories into various attributes. Respondents were again asked to check those which they thought were important for that category. At the conclusion of the questionnaire there was space provided for additional comments.

There were no requirements to sign the forms, although there was a provision to determine the respondents status as faculty or student.

RESULTS

The numerical data, for returns of the first questionnaire, are shown in Table I. There were forty faculty and one hundred two student surveys returned, rates of 57% and 51% respectively.

Students showed no preference for the sliding scale form as a first choice but nine chose it as second. Multiple choice, chosen by 42 respondents as first choice and 24 as second choice, was the most popular student choice, receiving a 32% response. There were no faculty who chose true or false as either first or second. The most popular form, as indicated by the faculty first place choice, was the circle choice, with eleven tallies. This form received seven votes as second preference. Multiple choice, however, reversed these figures. The anecdotal type was second, as a first place preference, among the faculty, with a tally of eight. A sum of eighteen votes for both the multiple choice and circle choice types of questionnaires were maximum among the faculty.

In combined count, the multiple choice received a total of eighty-four first and second places, which was 30% of the total. A bit behind, with a sum of forty-eight, was the circle choice, which claimed 19% of the total.

Some comments, such as those that follow, were received regarding the illustrated forms.

I ANECDOTAL

The consensus of the faculty who commented indicated this type would be the most informative and would allow more freedom of expression and feeling. Doubts existed, however, that students would give it proper attention and they would fail to return this type of form. Some faculty thought it would 'strongly encourage the evaluator to put thought in his evaluation,' while others claim, 'most students do not seem to want to take time for such a form.' The difficulty in tallying and reporting on results of such a form was also mentioned.

Students thought this gave them a better opportunity to express opinions but also thought that many may not like to do a lot of writing.

II MULTIPLE CHOICE

Thirty percent of the respondents checked this as either first of second preference. It was considered 'desireable' by many inasmuch as it required little effort to complete, and it made several choices available. Others, however, wanted some 'option to explain answers.'

III TRUE OR FALSE

This seemed the least popular, having been checked by only twelve students and no faculty. It was considered too restrictive by some respondents. 'Not refined enough,' says one, and, 'no in-between,' says another.

IV. FILL IN THE BLANKS

This was thought to be 'hard to tally,' and likely to be treated lightly by students. Also, there should be an option to explain answers.

V SCALE OF 1 TO 10

It was remarked, by a student, that students might not be really interested and just put any number down, 'without even reading the question.' Also, a 1 to 10 system was considered too artificial a barometer.

VI SLIDING SCALE

This allowed for the 'widest latitude of evaluation,' said one respondent, but another thought it was too confusing -- four categories and seven choices! Perhaps, the claim is made, with clearer directions this might be preferable. One student thought this would be the easiest to fill out.

VII CHECK-OFF SYSTEM

Some considered this the best because it contained a 'non-applicable' column, and they thought this should be a feature of any evaluation form. It was also mentioned there should be space left for comments.

VIII CIRCLE CHOICE

This second most popular choice was cited as being easy to fill out and would have been better received if the headings were clearer.

COMMENTS

One faculty member refused to select preferences inasmuch as it was based on 'input of the teaching act' rather than the 'output of the teaching act,' that is, student achievement. Another instructor was satisfied to require a

500 word composition on his course and methods, considering this more useful than any 'schematic formula.'

Other respondents wanted the form to include criteria to judge non-teaching personnel (i.e., librarians), and laboratory or clinical supervisors.

The numerical data, for section I of the second questionnaire, are shown in Table II. There were twenty-one faculty and eighty-one student surveys returned, rates of 30% and 41% respectively.

In section I no student thought publications or public service was one of the three most important factors for evaluating an instructor at Rhode Island Junior College. Faculty members failed to list management, performing arts, publications, and public service, among their selections. It is obvious, therefore, that no respondent thought publications or public service was a very important factor when evaluating faculty performance at Rhode Island Junior College.

All of the faculty and 89% of the students checked classroom teaching as one of the three most important attributes, while, percentages placed advising and faculty service in second and third place.

There were two faculty members who checked off 'other' categories. One listed 'curriculum developement' as an alternative and the other listed 'harmony with student organizations' as another alternative.

Some comments on each of the categories follows.

1. Classroom teaching

More than 50% of each group thought the following were unimportant attributes for

evaluation of an instructor.

sincere repetitious
motivated personable
distractions (sayings or mannerisms)
speaking speed (too fast, too slow)

A total greater than 90% thought repetitious and distractions were unnecessary traits to evaluate, while the only ones to be checked as necessary greater than 80% ot the time were clarity and fairness.

It was suggested by one respondent that another category under classroom teaching be attendance!

2. Advising

There were no attributes here which a majority of each group thought should not be included in a questionnaire. The largest majority, though, thought helpfulness was extremely important and sympathy the least important.

Comments were made that an instructor should know how to refer students to available services and be more knowledgeable about careers for students.

3. Faculty service and relations

Students minimized these factors and faculty tallies were not sufficient to cause any of them to receive more than a 70% rating. Some respondents thought there should be added traits such as 'good leader,' 'good follower,' 'works in interest of college,' and, 'works in interest of students.'

4. Management (administration)

Every student checked getting things done as important, but well-organized was, over all, the attribute thought most important by a majority of all respondents. A specific plea was made that 'students be allowed to make their own decisions on matters relating to students.'

5. Performing arts

Unless an instructor teaches in these fields, they were considered unimportant by a large majority, in all cases.

6. Professional services

Students, by a two to one majority, thought each of these was important, while faculty were about evenly divided on them.

7. Publications

With the exception of special reports, thought by the students to be important, by a one vote margin, no category received more than 40% of the tallies.

'They're not important,' says one respondent, and, 'a faculty member need not be a literary figure to be an effective teacher,' says another. It was suggested, though, that these attributes might indicate personal growth on the part of the faculty member.

8. Public service

All of these were considered overwhelmingly unimportant, especially church work. Some respondents thought it didn't really matter

to the school or to the students and that a faculty members life should 'be his own,' as long as it didn't take away from his school work.

9. Research

Investigation within the discipline was the only one considered unimportant by a majority of respondents. Some thought there should be an additional trait called bridging disciplines.

Comments

It was indicated by some respondents that the faculty should be concerned with school-age children in general and that teaching be 'a labor of love not merely a job for x amount of dollars.'

As an outcome of this study, the writer has designed a Rhode Island Junior College Faculty Questionnaire (Appendix C) which has incorporated the above results. Hopefully this instrument can be utilized in all departments at the college. It can be administered in a reasonably short period of time, and can be easily tallied. It meets the needs of a unique model, as Deegan[24] suggests, which fits the individual requirements of a district.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The difficulties involved in effectively evaluating teacher performance are legion. Any attempt to do so at Rhode Island Junior College must have the cooperation of all sectors of the college community. The instrument in Appendix C is not to be considered a final solution, but rather a first step on an arduous road to interaction among faculty, students, and administration for perfecting such an instrument. Faculty and students have had input into this version of the form and it is hoped, with widespread usage and distribution, it will be constantly revised and updated to more accurately reflect the concerns at Rhode Island Junior College and to better identify those faculty members in need of instructional improvement. To these ends, the following recommendations are made:

1. <u>The Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire should be used on a trial basis for the R. I. J. C. Summer Session, 1975</u>. This would enable us to determine such factors as time taken to administer the evaluation, ease of correcting, feasibility of obtaining and interpreting results, and the distribution of these results. It is suggested that all summer faculty be invited to participate in a revision seminar at the conclusion of the summer session in order to help amend any portion of the instrument

which needs it. Their suggestions and comments should be solicited.

2. A revision committee of nine people should be formed. This committee should be composed of two administrators, three students, and four faculty members. Their concern would be to revise and reform the evaluation to further reflect the concerns brought up by the summer session trial period and the seminar which followed. They should also devise an objective scoring system in order to set norms to base suggestions for improvement of faculty performance.

3. The improved questionnaire should be implemented in the 1975-76 academic year. An advertising campaign should be mounted early in the first semester to familiarize everyone with the non-punitive aspects of such an evaluation. It should be administered close to the end of the first semester so results could be obtained, distributed to those concerned, and discussed before the start of the second semester.

4. The administration should suggest, and offer, assistance to those faculty shown to be in need of improvement. This aid could come in the form of in-service courses, seminars, or travels to conferences. It is possible that some faculty, considered to be excellent instructors, could be offered paying jobs as teachers of these courses.

Teaching is still the most important function of an instructor at Rhode Island Junior College. There should be

some method of discovering whether it is being effectively done. If we are to remain a viable, effective, teaching institution we must effect change which will reflect a more cohesive faculty, student body, and administration, dedicated to quality instruction.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Agreement Between Rhode Island Board of Regents and Rhode Island Junior College Faculty Association. (RIEA/NEA), 1974-1975. p. 17.

2. Elbert L. Kinnibrew, and Leo R. Day, "Staff Evaluation, Sacramento City College, 1973," (Sacramento: ERIC Document # 088543.) p. 2.

3. Vandervert, Larry R., "Student Evaluation of Instruction: Some Theoretical Considerations and a Proposal," ERIC Document #039394. (Spokane Falls, Washington: March, 1974.)

4. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Can Faculty Evaluation Improve Instruction?" Community and Junior College Journal. 44: #3, Nov., 1973. p.19.

5. Robert H. McCabe, The Education Policy Systems. (Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1973.) p. 39.

6. Richard I. Miller, Evaluating Faculty Performance. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.) p. 29.

7. Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.) p. 30.

8. Deane G. Bornheimer, Gerald P. Burns, and Glenn S. Dumke, The Faculty in Higher Education. (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1973.) p. 21.

9. Arthur M. Cohen, and associates, A Constant Variable. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971.) p. 58.

10. Charles R. Monro, Profile of the Community College. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1973.) p. 283.

11. Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher,)p. 34.

12. Arthur M. Cohen, and Associates, A Constant Variable. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1971.) p. 58.

13. James W. Trent, and Clare Rose, A Faculty Assesses Its Teaching. A Survey of the U. C. L. A. Faculty. (Los Angeles: October, 1971.) p. 23.

14. Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1974.) p. 30.

15. Deegan, William L. and others, "Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report," ERIC Document #094847. (California: March, 1974.) p. 7.

16. Richard C. Richardson, Jr.,"Can Faculty Evaluation Improve Instruction?" Community and Junior College Journal. 44: #3, November, 1973. p. 19.

17. Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1974.) p. 8.

18. James W. Trent, and Clare Rose, A Faculty Assesses Its Teaching. A Survey of the U. C. L. A. Faculty. (Los Angeles: October, 1971.) p. 10.

19. Richard I. Miller, Evaluating Faculty Performance. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1972.) p. 6.

20. Robert Emmett Herman, "Project Insight: Video Taping as a Learning Medium," Community and Junior College Journal. 43: #3, November, 1972. p. 24.

21. Lawrence M. Aleamoni, "The Usefulness of Student Evaluation in Improving College Teaching," Research Report #356. (Urbana, Illinois: February, 1974.)

22. Win Kelley, and Leslie Wilbur, Teaching in the Community College. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Corp., 1970.) p. 182.

23. Richard I. Miller, Evaluating Faculty Performance. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1972.) p. 21

24. Deegan, William L., and others, "Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report," ERIC Document #094847. (California: March, 1974.) p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agreement Between Rhode Island Board of Regents and Rhode Island Junior College Faculty Association. (RIEA/NEA) Providence: 1974-1975

Aleamoni, Lawrence M. "The Usefulness of Student Evaluation in Improving College Teaching," Research Report #356. Urbana, Illinois: February, 1974.

Aleamoni, Lawrence M., and, Richard E. Spencer. "The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A Description of its Development and a Report of Some of its Results," Educational and Psychological Measurement. 33:669-684, Autumn, 1973.

Benedict, Larry. "A Practical Guide for Evaluation," ERIC Document #088903. West Hartford, Conn.: August, 1973.

Blount, Gail (compiler). "Teacher Evaluation: An Annotated Bibliography," ERIC Document #093033. Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, March, 1974.

Bornheimer, Deane G., Gerald P. Burns, and Glenn S. Dumke. The Faculty in Higher Education. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc. 1973.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Associates. A Constant Variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971.

Deegan, William L. "Should Students Evaluate Faculty?" Community and Junior College Journal. 43:25-6, October, 1972.

Deegan, William L. and others. "Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report," ERIC Document #094847. California: March, 1974.

Elbe, Kenneth E. Professors as Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.

"Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth. Current Trends in School Policies and Programs," ERIC Document #091846. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1974.

Herman, Robert Emmett. "Project Insight: Video Taping as a Learning Medium," Community and Journal College Journal. 43:3, November, 1972.

Keast, William R., and John Macy, Jr. Faculty Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Kelley, Win, and, Leslie Wilbur. Teaching in the Community College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Corporation, 1970.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "Student Evaluation of University Professors," School and Society. 99:353-356, October, 1971.

King, Michael, and, Mary Van Ryn. "A Report on the Analysis of Student Teacher Evaluation Forms used in New York State," ERIC Document #088823. Albany: New York State Department of Education, 1974.

Kinnibrew, Elbert L., and, Leo R. Day. "Staff Evaluation, Sacramento City College, 1973," ERIC Document #088543. Sacramento: 1973.

McCabe, Robert H. The Education Policy Systems. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1973.

Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Miller, Richard I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1972.

Monro, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Popham, James W. "Pitfalls and Pratfalls of Teacher Evaluation," Educational Leadership. 32:141-3+, November, 1974.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Can Faculty Evaluation Improve Instruction?" Community and Junior College Journal. 44:19-21, November, 1973.

Sawyer, Paul. "The Presentation: Testing Potential New Faculty's Ability to Teach," AAUP Journal. 60:379-82, Winter, 1974.

Trent, James W., and Clare Rose. A Faculty Assesses Its Teaching: A Survey of the U.C.L.A. Faculty. Los Angeles: October, 1971.

Vandervert, Larry R. "Student Evaluation of Instruction: Some Theoretical Considerations and a Proposal," ERIC Document #093394. Spokane Falls, Washington: March, 1974.

APPENDIX A

A QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE TYPE OF FACULTY EVALUATION FORM WHICH WOULD BE PREFERRED AT RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE

I would like to design a questionnaire to evaluate faculty and I want to get the consensus of some of the student body and faculty as to the best type of questionnaire to use. This survey seems lengthy but it will really only take a few minutes of your time to fill it out. When it's completed I'd appreciate it if you would return it to me by placing it in my mailbox in the office in the fourth floor, or in my office (F-3), or in the math lab, which is room 313.

Thank you for your help.

Joseph W. Menard
Mathematics Dept.

Please indicate if you are;

A. Faculty member _____

B. Student _____

When evaluating an instructor there is sometimes difficulty in getting people to return forms. Part of the reason for this may be the way the form is being asked to be filled out, and the manner in which it is presented! With your assistance, perhaps one can be designed which will be more likely to be completed and returned.

On the following pages there are seven types of forms illustrated. Would you choose two that you think are best and that you would like to receive if you had to fill it out? Mark the one you prefer most as #1 and your second choice as #2. If you wish to make any comment regarding each of the illustrations there is space provided after each one.

MY PREFERENCE:

I _____ ANECDOTAL

II _____ MULTIPLE CHOICE

III _____ TRUE OR FALSE

IV _____ FILL IN THE BLANKS

V _____ SCALE OF 1 TO 10

VI _____ SLIDING SCALE

VII _____ CHECK-OFF SYSTEM

VIII _____ CIRCLE CHOICE

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

I. ANECDOTAL. (You are asked to write a sentence or two about each characteristic.)

EXAMPLES:

1. What do you think about the fairness of this instructor regarding grading?

_____

_____

_____

2. Does this instructor know his subject matter?

_____

_____

_____

3. Is this instructor well organized?

_____

_____

_____

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

II. MULTIPLE CHOICE. (You are asked to circle correct response.)

EXAMPLES:

1. When grading students, I consider this instructor to be;

a) extremely fair
b) fair
c) unfair
d) very unfair

2. Regarding knowledge of subject matter, this instructor seems to be;

   a) well informed c) poorly informed

   b) informed d) uninformed

3. This instructor seems to be;

   a) well organized c) poorly organized

   b) organized d) unorganized

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

III. TRUE OR FALSE. (You are asked to circle T or F next to the question.)

EXAMPLES:

1. This instructor has a grading system which is fair. T F

2. This instructor seems to know his subject matter thoroughly. T F

3. This instructor seems to be well organized. T F

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

IV. FILL IN THE BLANKS. (You are asked to put an appropriate word in the blank.)

EXAMPLES: Fill the following blanks with words you feel best describe the instructor you are evaluating. The following list is not

complete, but is given as an aid.

fair	excellent	uninformed
poor	informed	unorganized
good	organized	useless

etc.

1. This instructor's grading system is _____.
2. This instructor's knowledge of his subject matter seems to be _____.
3. This instructor seems to be _____ organized.

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

V. SCALE OF 1 TO 10. (You are asked to rate the instructor with a number from 1 to 10, ten being the best.)

EXAMPLES:

1. _____ The instructor's grading system.
2. _____ The instructor's knowledge of his subject matter.
3. _____ The instructor's organization of his Class.

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

VI. SLIDING SCALE. (You are asked to put a cross, or some mark, on a number line for your appraisal of the instructor.)

	poor		fair		good		excel-lent
1. The instructor's grading system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The instructor's knowledge of his subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Organization of instructor's class.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

COMMENT: _____

_____

_____

VII. CHECK-OFF SYSTEM. You are asked to check one of the boxes.)

KEY-- NA: Not applicable or I don't know.
SA: Strongly agree with statement.
A: Agree with statement.
D: Disagree with statement.
SD: Strongly disagree with statement.

EXAMPLES:

	NA	SA	A	D	SD
1. This instructor's grading system is fair.					
2. This instructor has good knowledge of his subject.					
3. This instructor's class is well organized.					

COMMENTS: _____

_____

VIII. CIRCLE CHOICE. (You are asked to circle your choice of appraisal for this instructor.)

EXAMPLES:

	NA	EXCEL LENT	GOOD	SATIS FACTORY	FAIR	POOR
1. The instructor's grading system.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The instructor's knowledge of subject matter.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Organization of instructor's class.	1	2	3	4	5	6

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

A QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNED TO DETERMINE FACTORS AND ATTRIBUTES NECESSARY FOR EVALUATING FACULTY AT RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE

When evaluating an instructor in any particular course, the use of the results must be clear. Are they for promotion, retention, retrenchment, etc.? There should be different directions taken for the various uses. This questionnaire is designed to get your preferences to the characteristics that should be evaluated when our goal is to <u>improve faculty performance</u> at Rhode Island Junior College.

Comments at the conclusion would be appreciated.

Thank you.

Joseph W. Menard
Math department

Your status:
Faculty_____
Student_____

I. WILL YOU PLEASE CHECK OFF THREE (3) CATEGORIES OF THOSE LISTED BELOW THAT YOU THINK ARE MOST IMPORTANT FOR GUAGING FACULTY PERFORMANCE AT R. I. J. C.

___ 1. Classroom teaching
___ 2. Advising
___ 3. Faculty service and relations
___ 4. Management (administration)
___ 5. Performing or visual arts
___ 6. Professional services
___ 7. Publications
___ 8. Public service
___ 9. Research
___ 10. Other (please signify)

II. UNDER EACH OF THE CATEGORIES LISTED BELOW, WHETHER THEY WERE ONE OF YOUR THREE CHOICES OR NOT, PLEASE CHECK THOSE ATTRIBUTES WHICH YOU DEEM NECESSARY TO EVALUATE AN INSTRUCTOR AT RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE.

1. <u>Classroom teaching</u>

___ audible
___ clarity
___ stimulating
___ approachable
___ flexible
___ patient
___ sustains interest
___ sincere
___ neat appearance
___ fair (assignments, grading)
___ coverage of material
___ speaking speed (too fast, too slow)
___ organization of material
___ legible writing
___ repetitious
___ imaginative
___ motivated
___ listens
___ personable
___ arouses interest
___ sense of humour
___ courtesy

___ organization of presentation
___ distractions (sayings or mannerisms)
___ allows opposing views
___ uses teaching aids effectively
___ dynamic and energetic
___ enjoys what he's doing
___ presents course objectives
___ choice of textbook
___ quality of class discussion
___ other (please signify)

2. Advi
___ frie
___ understanding
___ sympathetic
___ approachable
___ courteous
___ helpful
___ objective
___ student-oriented
___ other (please signify)

3. Faculty service and relations
___ works well as a committee member
___ well-read beyond subject matter
___ enjoys good working rapport with other faculty
___ other (please signify)

4. Management (administration)

___ gets along with others
___ gets things done
___ is well organized
___ is prompt
___ other (please signify)

5. Performing and visual arts

___ plays musical instrument
___ paints
___ sculpts
___ writes (plays, prose, poetry, etc.)
___ acts in plays
___ other (please signify)

6. Professional services

___ belongs to an association within his discipline (Math Society, English Assoc., etc.)
___ attends conferences within his discipline
___ other (please signify)

7. Publications

___ books
___ monographs
___ special reports
___ chapters in books
___ periodical articles
___ other (please signify)

8. Public service

___ works for alma mater (alumni, fund drive, etc.)
___ church work
___ community works (Little League, Jaycees, etc.)
___ other (please signify)

9. Research

___ investigation within classroom
___ investigation within discipline
___ investigation within college
___ other (please signify)

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE
FACULTY EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

R. I. J. C. FACULTY EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

THIS FORM WAS DESIGNED TO ASSIST US TO EVALUATE EFFECTIVE TEACHING AT RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE. IT GIVES YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO ANONYMOUSLY EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS OF THIS COURSE AND HOW IT WAS TAUGHT. THE RESULTS WILL NOT BE USED TO DETERMINE PROMOTION, RETENTION, OR RAISES FOR FACULTY. IT'S MAIN PURPOSE IS TO INFORM INSTRUCTOR'S WHERE ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT EXISTS IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THE EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF RHODE ISLAND JUNIOR COLLEGE.

THERE WILL BE NO PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS. THE ADMINISTRATION, OR AN EVALUATION COMMITTEE, WILL INFORM INSTRUCTORS OF CONCLUSIONS, INDIVIDUALLY.

DIRECTIONS

Each question has five possible choices. You are asked to circle the letter before the one you believe best describes your feelings about the instructor and the course. If you feel you are not qualified to answer a particular question, or that it doesn't apply to you, or you do not know the answer, please circle the fifth choice, NA.

On the right of each page there is a column headed, COMMENTS, which allows you to express an opinion on any question or to clarify any answer, if you wish.

At the conclusion of the questionnaire there is space provided if you have any additional comments.

Instructor's name _____ Date_____

Subject _____

Evaluator's status: Student _____
Colleague _____
Department chairman _____

This course was: Required _____
Elective _____

SECTION I. Only students who have had this instructor in class should answer this section.

COMMENTS

1. The instructor's voice was clearly audible,
   a. all of the time
   b. most of the time
   c. some of the time
   d. none of the time
   e. NA

2. The instructor's directions and explanations were clearly understood,
   a. all of the time
   b. most of the time
   c. some of the time
   d. none of the time
   e. NA

3. The instructor stimulated me to more interest in this subject,
   a. all of the time
   b. most of the time
   c. some of the time
   d. none of the time
   e. NA

4. Regarding subject matter, this instructor,
   a. covered too much material
   b. covered sufficient material
   c. covered too little material
   d. covered no material
   e. NA

COMMENTS

5. I found the time required to complete outside assignments for this course, to be,
   a. more than adequate
   b. adequate
   c. less than adequate
   d. completely inadequate
   e. NA

6. The instructor's grading system seemed to be,
   a. excellent
   b. good
   c. fair
   d. poor
   e. NA

7. The instructor's tests and exams cover the class material,
   a. extremely well, always
   b. very well, mostly
   c. sometimes, well
   d. not at all
   e. NA

8. The instructor's organization of his lectures seemed to be,
   a. excellent
   b. good
   c. fair
   d. poor
   e. NA

9. The objectives of this course were,
   a. clearly understood
   b. fairly well understood
   c. understood
   d. not understood at all
   e. NA

10. The quality of class discussion in this class seemed to be,
    a. excellent
    b. good
    c. fair
    d. poor
    e. NA

COMMENTS

11. The instructor displays a courteous demeanor to students,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

12. The instructor is accessible to assist students,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

13. The instructor displays patience with students,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

14. This instructor allows opposing views in the classroom,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

15. The instructor is dynamic,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

16. The instructor seems to enjoy teaching,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

COMMENTS

17. The instructor's overall attitude toward students and teaching seems to be,
    a. enthusiastic
    b. interested
    c. mildly interested
    d. disinterested
    e. NA

18. The instructor encourages students to ask questions,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

19. The instructor satisfactorily answers questions in class,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

20. The instructor is prompt for class,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

21. The instructor is in his office during office hours,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

SECTION II. Only students who have had this faculty member as an advisor, or who has sought his advice relating to scheduling, should complete this section.

COMMENTS

22. When asked for advice, the instructor seemed,
    a. really interested to help
    b. willing to help
    c. doing his 'job'
    d. no help at all
    e. NA

23. When giving advice, the instructor,
    a. seemed to know all the answers
    b. knew some answers and where to find others
    c. knew very little but knew where to refer people
    d. knew very little and helped very little
    e. NA

24. When approached for advice, the instructor seemed,
    a. very courteous
    b. civil
    c. blunt
    d. offensive
    e. NA

25. As an advisor, the instructor,
    a. considered my problems and thoughtfully assisted me
    b. made sure I took a course in his discipline, regardless of how it helped me
    c. didn't really care about me and my circumstances
    d. was prejudiced against other disciplines
    e. NA

26. If I could choose this instructor as an academic advisor,
    a. I would be glad to
    b. I would prefer not to
    c. it wouldn't make any difference
    d. I would refuse
    e. NA

COMMENTS

27. The instructor is available to advise students,
    a. most of the time when he isn't in class
    b. a large part of his time
    c. during office hours only
    d. hardly ever
    e. NA

SECTION III. Only faculty colleagues and department chairmen should answer this section.

28. This instructor seems to,
    a. be an extremely capable committee worker
    b. works willingly on committees
    c. works grudgingly on committees
    d. refuses committee assignments
    e. NA

29. The instructor seems to,
    a. be well-read beyond his subject field
    b. be knowledgeable in his subject field only
    c. have limited reading experience
    d. have never read beyond his college experience
    e. NA

30. The instructor seems to,
    a. have excellent rapport with other faculty members
    b. have good rapport with other faculty members
    c. have little rapport with other faculty members
    d. have no rapport with other faculty members
    e. NA

COMMENTS

31. The instructor belongs to an association within his discipline and seems to,
    a. use this affiliation to improve himself for the benefit of his students
    b. use this affiliation to improve himself advancement or promotion only
    c. use this affiliation as a prestige factor
    d. not take advantage of his affiliation
    e. NA

32. It seems this instructor attends conferences mainly to,
    a. improve himself and benefit R.I.J.C.
    b. get away from the normal pace for a while
    c. get out of work at school
    d. have a vacation
    e. NA

33. The instructor has written (published or not) something which is,
    a. meaningful, in his field
    b. meaningful, not in his field
    c. of dubious value
    d. useless
    e. NA

34. The instructor has done some research and investigation in his classroom which,
    a. helped improve his instructional abilities
    b. helped others improve their instructional abilities
    c. helped to clarify deficiencies in instruction
    d. were meaningless
    e. NA

COMMENTS

35. The instructor has done some research and investigation within the college which,
    a. helped improve his instructional abilities
    b. helped others improve their instructional abilities
    c. helped to clarify deficiencies in instruction
    d. were meaningless
    e. NA

36. As a resource person to help others to improve their teaching performance, this instructor would be,
    a. extremely capable
    b. capable
    c. good
    d. poor
    e. NA

SECTION IV. Only students who have had this instructor for a laboratory experience should answer this section.

37. During lab periods, the instructor is,
    a. always present
    b. present most of the time
    c. present some of the time
    d. never present
    e. NA

38. During lab periods, the instructor has a,
    a. highly qualified lab assistant
    b. qualified lab assistant
    c. lab assistant
    d. no lab assistant
    e. NA

COMMENTS

39. During laboratory periods, the instructor,
   a. circulates about the room assisting students
   b. helps students when they call
   c. is off by himself doing his own work and is difficult to get help from
   d. gives no help whatsoever
   e. NA

40. The instructor's lab directions are,
   a. very clear
   b. reasonably clear
   c. unclear and confusing
   d. almost non-existent
   e. NA

41. The instructor's lab periods are,
   a. extremely well-organized
   b. well-organized
   c. poorly organized
   d. not organized
   e. NA

42. The experiments in the lab were,
   a. reasonable and could be done in the time allotted
   b. reasonable but couldn't be done in the time allotted
   c. very difficult and unreasonable
   d. not related to class work
   e. NA

43. During lab period , the instructor,
   a. treated us as adults and mature students
   b. treated us as immature students
   c. treated us as children
   d. was indifferent to us
   e. NA

SECTION V. Only students who are out in the field and are visited by an instructor for observation should answer this section.

COMMENTS

44. When observing students in a clinical situation, the instructor,
   a. always informed the students of the visit beforehand
   b. almost always informed the students of the visit beforehand
   c. sometimes informed the students of the visit beforehand
   d. never informed the students of the visit beforehand
   d. NA

45. When observing students in a clinical situation, the instructor,
   a. speaks to the student after the visit, privately
   b. speaks to the student after, without regard for privacy
   c. speaks to the student about the visit, at a later time
   d. doesn't speak to the student about the visit
   e. NA

46. The instructor seems to,
   a. understand the problems encountered in a field experience and takes that into account in reports
   b. understands the problems encountered in a field experience but fails to take it into account in reports
   c. doesn't fully understand problems of field experience
   d. has no comprehension of problems of field experience
   e. NA

COMMENTS

47. The instructor's evaluation of students seems to be fair,
    a. all of the time
    b. most of the time
    c. some of the time
    d. none of the time
    e. NA

SECTION VI. Students, colleagues, and chairmen should complete this section.

COMMENTS

48. My overall opinion of the instructor as an effective teacher, is,
    a. excellent
    b. good
    c. average
    d. poor
    e. NA

49. The instructor's knowledge of his subject seems to be,
    a. excellent
    b. above average
    c. average
    d. poor
    e. NA

50 Compared to other instructors, this instructor is,
    a. one of the most effective
    b. more effective than most
    c. not as effective as most
    d. one of least effective
    e. NA

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

TABLE I

NUMERICAL DATA FOR APPENDIX A,
QUESTIONNAIRE AND FORM PREFERENCE

		Preferences						
		Student		Faculty		Totals		
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	Both
I	ANECDOTAL	15	12	8	4	23	16	39
II	MULTIPLE CHOICE	42	24	7	11	49	35	84
III	TRUE OR FALSE	9	3	0	0	9	3	12
IV	FILL IN THE BLANKS	9	18	0	2	9	20	29
V	SCALE OF 1 TO 10	9	3	5	1	14	4	18
VI	SLIDING SCALE	0	9	5	11	5	20	25
VII	CHECK-OFF SYSTEM	12	9	4	4	16	13	29
VIII	CIRCLE CHOICE	6	24	11	7	17	31	48

Total student returns = 102
Total faculty returns = 40

TABLE II

NUMERICAL DATA FOR APPENDIX B,

QUESTIONNAIRE ON FACTORS AND ATTRIBUTES

(SECTIONI)

	Categories	Student	Faculty
1.	Classroom teaching	72	21
2.	Advising	65	15
3.	Faculty service and relations	52	14
4.	Management (administration)	13	0
5.	Performing or visual arts	11	0
6.	Professional services	27	7
7.	Publications	0	0
8.	Public service	0	0
9.	Research	3	4
10.	Others	0	2

Total student returns = 81

Total faculty returns = 21

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 3 1 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES